DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 144 UD 012 121

TITLE	Evaluation Report of the Intensive Learning Center.
INSTITUTION	Kansas City Board of Education, Kans.
PUB DATE	[70]
NOTE	72p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Achievement Gains; *Compensatory Education Programs; Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Diagnosis; Instructional Materials; Kindergarten; Parent Reaction; Primary Grades; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Programs; Student Teacher Ratio; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; Kansas

ABSTRACT

The Intensive Learning Centers were installed in thirteen schools, eight of which were funded by ESEA Title I. The educational program consisted of placing two certified teachers in each classroom from kindergarten to grade two. High interest, high activity materials and an optimum amount of audio visual equipment were used. Program evaluation consisted of pre- and post-testing at each grade level. A random sample of all students in the program were administered the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test on a pre- and post-test basis. First graders were administered the Metropolitan Readiness Test at the beginning of the year and the Metropolitan Achievement Test Primary One at the end of the year. At grade two, the California Achievement Test, Lower Primary was used. In addition, subjective evaluation was carried on by parent survey and teacher questionnaire. [Several pages of this document are not clearly legible due to the quality of print in the original.] (Author/JM)

FEB 14 1972

ED 060144

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE INTENSIVE LEARNING CENTER

ABSTRACT

The Intensive Learning Centers of Kansas City, Kansas were placed in five schools funded by Model Cities' funds and eight schools funded by Title I ESEA. The Educational Program in the Intensive Learning Centers consisted of placing two certified teachers in each classroom in the school at grades, Kindergarten, One and Two. Special materials were used by the teachers which consisted of high interest, high activity materials, and an optimum amount of audio visual equipment.

Unique in the program was the staggering of the beginning and dismissal times of school so that half of the students arrived at 8:30 a.m. and the other half arrived one hour later so that the two teachers in the classroom could work one hour with half of the students in small groups for reading. The first group left an hour earlier in the afternoon giving the teachers the opportunity to have small groups with those who arrived later in the morning.

The evaluation of the program in the Intensive Learning Center consisted of administering the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test at a pre- and post test basis to a ten percent random sample of all students in the program at all three grades. In the eight schools funded under Title I, ESEA, this sample consisted of 40 students at Kindergarten, 44 at grade one, and 44 at grade two. In the Intensive Learning Centers carried on under Model Cities' Funds, the ten percent random sample consisted of 38 students at the Kindergarten level, 34 at Grade One, 36 students at Grade Two. All Stanford Binet Tests were administered by a certified school psychologists, or by a certified elementary counselors who were qualified to administer individual intelligence tests based on University level course work. The evaluation consisted of two separate segments, one for the schools under Model Cities' funding and another parallel evaluation completed for schools that were funded from Title I, ESEA. In addition to the Stanford Achievement pre and post test, the Metropolitan Readiness Test was administered to first graders at the beginning of the year. The Metropolitan Achievement Test Primary One was administered at the end of Grade One. At Grade Two, the California Achievement Test, Lower Primary , form W was used as a pre-test and the equivalent form X was used as a post test. At the Grade Two level, the pre and post testing consisted of the reading sub-test, the arithmetic sub-test and the Language sub-test administered to all second grade students. All pre and post test results were submitted to one way analysis of variance for all grades and for each sub-test in each project. In the Title I ESEA funded projects, the increase in IQ as measured by the Stanford-Binet was an average of 3.2 I.Q. points per student at the Kindergarten level, 4.8 at Grade One and 3.9 at Grade Two. In the Model Cities funded projects, the increase recorded was 4.6 at Kindergarten, 5.1 at Grade One and 5.8 at Grade Two. These results are consistent with Results of evaluations of Intensive Learning Centers in previous years.

Some difficulty was encountered in attempting to compare the Metropolitan Readiness as a Pre-test with Metropolitan Achievement Test as a Post-test. In each case, seemingly, the Post-test was lower than the Pre-test; however, because of the lack of uniformity of reporting standardized score, it is doubtful that the two

UD 012121

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

could be compared statistically and it is even doubtful if readiness and achievement can be compared philosophically. The test of the evaluation; however, contains an explanation of the statistical manipulation that was necessary, as well as, some suspected reasons for the Post-test being lower than the Pre-test.

In Grade Two, the Post-test results of the Reading Sub-test of the California Lower Primary Battery was greater than the Pre-test results at the one percent level in all cases in the Title I ESEA Project, with the exception of one school which was significant at the 5 percent level. In the Model Cities' funded projects four of the five schools showed increases at the Post-test level significant at the one percent level, and one school showed significance at the five percent level. In figuring all schools combined for each project, the "F" ratio obtained on the California Pre and Post tests exceeded 100 and was highly significant at the one percent leve.

The Arithmetic Sub-tests of the California Achievement Test showed significance in six of the eight schools of the Title I ESEA Program and in four of five schools in Title I Programs. Two schools were not significant at five percent level in the Title I programs and one school was not significant at the five percent level of Model Cities on the Arithmetic sub-tests.

Other tables in the evaluation show numbers of students who increased, remained the same or decreased on each sub-test in each grade in each schools of the project. In addition to statistical analysis of Pre and Post test, subjective evaluation was carried on by parent survey and teacher questionnaires. Copies of the survey and questionnaires are included in the evaluation with tabulated results of each question along with text narrative interpreting both the parent survey and the teacher questionnaire.

Activity Description

Describe the activity including procedures and techniques utilized in implementation.
How were the participants selected?
What was the pupil-teacher ratio?

The Intensive Learning Centers were placed in eight schools using Title I funds after one year of pilot study at Kealing Elementary School followed by a second year of expansion at Kealing and Douglass Elementary Schools.

The results of the two year operation, upon evaluation, proved to be so successful that the value of taking the program to other elementary schools could not be questioned. The eight schools selected for the Intensive Learning Centers were those that qualified for Title I Funds and on the basis of the students who attended the schools were most educationally deprived.

Because of the nature of the program, it is not feasible to isolate only those who score below grade level since pre-test results show that the large majority of students in each of the eight centers would be substantially below grade level based on publisher's norms. There are several unique features to the Intensive Learning Center. Two teachers are employed for each classroom thereby assuming a ratio of approximately 14 students for each teacher. Beginning times are staggered with half of the students arriving at eight o'clock in the morning with both teachers working with that half of the students. The other half of the students arrive at nine o'clock and remain one hour beyond the dismissal time for those who arrived early, thus giving the late arrivers an hour work with both teachers. Lunch period times are also staggered thus creating four hours during the day when both teachers work with half of the students.

During the time when both teachers are working with the smaller groups, the Language Arts section of the curriculum is taught. Team teaching is used for

UD 012121

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

such subjects as Arithmetic, Science and Social Science with all other subjects being taught cooperatively by the teachers employing the strength of the teachers in the particular subject matter area. In this way, a teacher well versed in teaching music or art might use her expertise while the strength of the second teacher would be used in some other subject matter area with the entire group.

Another unique feature of the Intensive Learning Center is that prior to the beginning of each school year, all teachers who will be teaching in the Center goes through an intensive one-week workshop so that new materials developed for the program, as well as, audio visual aids and equipment can be fairly analyzed so that optimum use may be made of them. Each of the Intensive Learning Centers has one non-teaching consultant to work with the teachers of that Center to enable teachers to have the benefit of an on-sight expert. Additionally, the consultant at the Center would work with the development of any new materials, as well as, working with any particularly difficult situations in their single classroom.

As a supportive service to the Intensive Learning Center, Elementary Counselors funded under Title I are assigned so that there can be close liaison with homes, as well as, adjustment counseling work with individual students can be accomplished. Elementary counselors serve as liason personnel with referral services if such are needed.

Measurement

Describe the method used to determine the effectiveness of the training received in this activity.

Several measures were used as instruments to test the effectiveness of the Intensive Learning Center. Additionally, these measures were used to justify continuation of the program. At the pre-test level, they served to show rather extreme educational deprivation.

The Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test was administered to approximately 130 students on a pre-test, post-test basis. The Stanford Binet was deemed to be an appropriate test since the project itself leans towards correcting deficiencies in Reading and Reading Ability; consequently, the non-reading Stanford-Binet was administered by certified elementary counselors and certified school psychologists, to a sample of ten percent of the students at each grade level in the school.

The Stanford-Binet was given at the beginning of the project and again at the end of the project to those who remained from the pre-tested group, consisting of 40 students at Kindergarten and 44 students at both Grade I and Grade II. At the First Grade level, the Metropolitan Readiness Test was administered to all subjects at that grade level in each of the Intensive Learning Centers. As a post-test, the Metropolitan Achievement Test was administered to Grade 1 during the last month of the school year. Though results will be reported, the Metropolitan Readiness Tests did not prove to be adequate measure at the beginning of Grade one since norms are established on a random sample of students during 1964. Between the time of the standardization and the present, a great deal has been done to upgrade Kindergarten programs, consequently, the readiness tests at the beginning of Grade One proved to be much too simple for students who had been through a normal

Kindergarten in 1969 and 1970. Further problems developed with the Metropolitan Readiness - Metropolitan Achievement Test comparisons, in that it is extremely difficult to match sub-tests for statistical comparison. In addition, the publisher reports the total scores in the Readiness Tests in terms of percentiles while the raw scores of each of the sub-tests of the Achievement Tests must be reported in Standard Scores and Grade Levels. To extrapolate and put each of the scores in a common measure requires some assumptions that may not prove valid on the basis of the norming of 1964. In order to get into a total score, it is necessary to average standard scores on the achievement test. Though, this is defensible statistically, there is little relationship between the appearance of the two scores finally submitted to statistical analysis.

At Grade Two, the California Achievement Test Lower Primary Battery was administered using Form W as a pre-test and Form X of the same battery as the post-test. On this particular test, the norms are reported as beginning of the year norms and end of the year norms with standard score equivalence to raw scores at each level. Consequently, the test proved highly adequate and required no interpolation of scores whatsoever. Upon submitting to analysis of variance, results were quite encouraging at second grade level.

In addition to objective tests given at the end of the year program, questionnaires were sent to all parents of students who had children in the Intensive Learning Centers after the twenty-seventh week of school. These questionnaires referred to the kinds of activities which increased achievement, the kinds of activities that created good attitudes on the part of the students and parents, and the part that audio visual equipment plays in learning. A second questionnaire was given to all teachers who taught in schools where Intensive Learning Centers were

operating. This included all teachers at all grade levels, as well as, principals and other certified personnel even though the Intensive Learning Center was operated for only Kindergarten, grades one and two. The results of the questionnaires are reported in narrative following the statistical analysis.

The Analysis of Variance Program was used to compare all pre and post test data. Not only was the Analysis of Variance completed for schools combined, but Analysis of Variance was also used to compare each school's pre and post test result on the Stanford Binet Intelligence Test at Grades Kindergarten, One and Two, the Metropolitan Readiness Test-the Metropolitan Achievement Test at Grade One, and the California Achievement Test alternate forms at Grade Two.

In addition to the Analysis of Variance further work was done in establishing numbers of students who scored above Grade Level based on the National Norms at the beginning of the program. Further analysis was done in Grade placement norms to indicate areas of strength and weakness upon which the in-service program for prospective teachers in future programs might benefit.

Performance Criteria

List the behavioral objectives of this activity. (Objectives that can be measured - What the student "can do" or "will do" at the end of the period of training.)

1. Pre and post measurement using the Stanford - Binet Intelligent Test to show that IQ can be increased at each grade level while the student is in the Intensive Learning Center.

2. Pre and Post Achievement Measure to show that achievement can be increased over the rate of achievement previously exhibited by the student.

3. To establish communication with parents so that they might be fully knowledgeable about and involved in the work of the student while he is in the Intensive Learning Center. This is done by pre-meetings with parents, use of elementary counselors as liasons and the distribution questionnaires testing parent attitude toward the program.

Analyzing Data

What was the basis for judging the progress of the group?
To what extent were the objectives achieved?

The Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test was administered to 10% random sample of students at the pre-test level. Post testing with the Stanford Binet after attrition from the program resulted in 40 students included in the pre and post testing in Kindergarten, 44 at grade one, and 44 at grade two. Since the random sample was made at each school, some schools had a very small number of students included in the sample. However, based on pre test and post test averages, all schools at the Kindergarten level with the exception of one increased in IQ with the average increase being approximately one point which was not significant considering the small number tested. At grade one, all schools had a higher post test average than pre test average and for schools combined, the change of 4.8 IQ increase was noted. At grade two, all schools increased with the exception of one which had a rather substantial decrease. Investigation is being made into this particular decrease since it seems unlikely that a decrease should have been as large as that noted. However, even including the decrease at the post test level for one school, all schools combined had an average increase of 3.9 IQ points.

Using the Stanford Binet National Norms of 100, it should be noted that of the 40 students at the Kindergarten level, only 12 randomly selected students were at or above the national norm. At grade one, only 17 of the 44 randomly selected students were at or above the national norm and at grade two, only 14 of the 44 randomly selected students scored 100 or higher on the pre test. Projecting the random selection to the total population in the Intensive Learning Centers, it should be noted that approximately 70 to 80% of students would be below the national

--

average for ability at the time of the pre-test. At the grade one level, the comparison of the Metropolitan Readiness Test as a pre test to the Metropolitan Achievement Test as a post test proved inappropriate since the pre-test results placed the group at a percentile level above what might be expected from the students in the Intensive Learning Center based on all other measures. However, four tables were drawn up taking the sub test of the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Word Discrimination, Word Knowledge, Reading and Arithmetic, with median scores at the time of the post test indicated that the norm of 1.9 was achieved at several schools on several of the sub tests. It must be assumed that the students achieved rather substantially during the first year. Since ability and other measures would indicate that the near norm level on the post test was a substantial accomplishment.

At grade two, the California Achievement Test Lower Primary Level, Form W, was used as the pre-test and equivalent Form X was used as a post test. Standard scores from the beginning of the year, Publisher's Norms were used for the pre-test and compared with Standard scores obtained from end of the year Publisher's Norms on the post test. The results of the comparison showed that on Reading, there was individual gain at each school which resulted in a "F" ratio from the Analysis of Variance that was significant at the 1% level for all except for one school which was significant at the 5% level. On Arithmetic, there was also a gain at each school; however, of the eight schools tested, six were significant at the 1% level, two were not significant. Further, a comparison of the results based on grade level showed that the post test total who scored at or above grade level was, in each case, greater than those who scored at or above grade level on the pre-test. This was true of Reading, Arithmetic, and Language. Further comparison showed that 34 students out of a total of 455 scored at or above grade level in all three categories, Reading, Arithmetic and Language. With these kinds of data, at Kindergarten, grade one, and

grade two, there is little doubt that students are educationally deprived in the eight schools at the pre-test level and that the gains over one year in the Intensive Learning Center has done much to overcome that deprivation.

The objectives of increasing IQ based on pre and post Stanford Binet Intelligence testing was achieved at each grade level. Though the increase at the Kindergarten level must be regarded as quite small, the objective of increasing achievement over the rate obtained previously by the students in the Intensive Learning Centers was achieved beyond a doubt by using the results of the California Achievement Test at grade two. Data presently available on grade one is less conclusive though end of the year results would indicate that the nearness to grade level norms showed substantial increase in achievement.

KINDERGARTEN

Results of Pre and Post test average scores on the Stanford Binet Intelligence Test. Results are based on ten percent random sample of students in the project.

School	Pre-test Average	Post-test Average	Number	Change	F-Ratio
Douglass	95.8	98.2	6	2.4	.0515
Frank Rushton	96.8	102.7	7	5.9	.2404
John Fiske	88.6	96.8	5	8.2	1.5821
Kealing	90.4	92.5	8	2.1	.9145
Lowell	101.7	102.0	3	.3	.0009
Morse	87.0	93.0	1	6.0	.0000
Riverview	100.2	107.4	5	7.2	.2408
Stanley	92.4	88.6	5	-3.8	.4076
All Schools	94.6	~~95.4~~ 97.8	40	~~.8~~ 3.2	.9204

GRADE I

Results of Pre and Post test Average Scores on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence test. Results are based on a ten percent random sample of students in the project.

School	Pre-test Average	Post-test Average	Number	Change	F-Ratio
Douglass	103.0	106.8	5	3.8	.1886
Frank Rushton	116.2	117.4	5	1.2	.0090
John Fiske	100.0	113.7	3	13.7	.6401
Kealing	87.4	91.8	9	4.4	.4314
Lowell	99.1	109.1	8	10.0	.6541
Morse	95.0	99.7	3	4.7	.4100
Riverview	91.3	93.5	4	2.2	.0791
Stanley	94.0	94.7	7	.7	.0056
All Schools	97.4	102.2	44	4.8	1.4850

GRADE II

Results of Pre and Post test averages on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence test. Results based on a ten percent sample of students in the project.

School	Pre-test Average	Post-test Average	Number	Change	F-Ratio
Douglass	89.2	94.2	9	5.0	.5547
Frank Rushton	106.8	118.2	5	11.4	.9550
John Fiske	92.1	96.7	7	4.6	2.5628
Kealing	96.0	89.2	5	-6.8	1.4487
Lowell	92.6	102.0	5	9.4	2.0616
Morse	96.5	96.8	4	.3	.0004
Riverview	91.3	96.3	4	5.0	.3107
Stanley	89.8	90.2	5	.4	.0019
All Schools	93.7	97.6	44	3.9	1.3675

Number of Students at Grades K, 1, and 2 Who Are At or Above the Norm
On the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale Pre-Test

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade
Douglass	3	3	2
Frank Rushton	2	4	4
John Fiske	0	2	2
Kealing	1	1	1
Lowell	2	4	1
Morse	0	0	2
Riverview	3	1	1
Stanley	1	2	1
Total	12	17	14
Total Possible	40	44	44

GRADE I

Metropolitan Readiness - Metropolitan Achievement

Results of Pre and Post testing with the Metropolitan Readiness and Achievement tests. Results are based on interpolated standard score values for the Readiness test and average standard score values for the achievement tests.

School	Pre-test Average	Post-test Average	Number	Change
Douglass	55.1	50.7	65	-4.4
Frank Rushton	55.6	46.4	78	-9.2
John Fiske	49.5	45.0	70	-4.5
Kealing	51.2	48.9	73	-2.3
Lowell	53.1	45.3	72	-7.8
Morse	58.3	49.5	31	-8.8
Riverview	51.1	43.1	34	-8.0
Stanley	50.8	48.2	72	-2.6
All Schools	52.8	47.4	495	-5.4

Results of Metropolitan Achievement Test at End of Grade I
(Norm - Grade Placement 1.9) Subtest Recorded Are
WORD KNOWLEDGE

Grade Placement	Douglass	F. Rushton	J. Fiske	Kealing	Lowell	Morse	Riverview	Stanley	TOTALS
1.0-				1					1
1.0	1	1		1					3
1.1	1				1		2	1	5
1.2	3	1	1	1	3		2	1	12
1.3	4	1	4	3	2	2	2	6	24
1.4	4	5	3	1	6		5		24
1.5	6	5	3	2	4		3	2	25
1.6	9	9	9	4	8	1	6	12	58
1.7	9	9	7	14	6	2	5	8	61
1.8	9	8	11	7	9	3	3	5	55
1.9	7	14	8	8	8	10	1	8	64
2.0	3	4	4	6	4	1	1	1	24
2.1		4	2	4	1	2	2	2	17
2.2	3	1	2	2	3	1	2	4	18
2.3								1	1
2.4		3		2	2	2		4	13
2.5	1	2	1	3		1	1	5	14
2.6									0
2.6 +	4	2		9	8	4	2	13	42
Totals	64	69	55	68	65	29	37	73	461
Median	1.70	1.80	1.75	1.85	1.78	1.90	1.65	1.80	

Results of Metropolitan Achievement Test at End of Grade I
(Norm - Grade Placement 1.9) Subtest Recorded Are
WORD DISCRIMINATION

Grade Placement	Douglass	F. Rushton	J. Fiske	Kealing	Lowell	Morse	Riverview	Stanley	TOTALS
1.0-									
1.0									
1.1									
1.2	4	3	6	2	4		3	3	25
1.3	8	5	3	3	5	1	1	5	31
1.4	8	4	4	2	11	2	9	7	47
1.5	5	6	8	9	2		10	5	45
1.6	4	7	5	4	2	2	1	9	34
1.7	8	7	5	7	7	3	1	5	43
1.8	6	3	3	3	8	4	2	5	34
1.9	3	6	5	12	7	5	2	7	47
2.0	3	8	6	3	4	1	1	1	27
2.1	4	3	3	5	1			1	17
2.2	1	3	3	2	2	1		2	14
2.3		1	2	4		4		6	17
2.4	3	3			1	2	1	5	15
2.5	4	2		4	2		2	3	17
2.6		2	1	2	3		2	3	13
2.6 +	3	6	1	6	6	4	2	6	34
Totals	64	69	55	68	65	29	37	73	459
Median	1.70	1.85	1.75	1.88	1.78	1.95	1.50	1.85	

Results of Metropolitan Achievement Test at End of Grade I
(Norm - Grade Placement 1.9) Subtest Recorded Are
READING

Grade Placement	Douglass	F. Rushton	J. Fiske	Kealing	Lowell	Morse	Riverview	Stanley	TOTALS
1.0-									
1.0									
1.1							2		2
1.2			1						1
1.3		2	3		2			7	14
1.4	1	2	1	2	1			3	10
1.5	2	9	8	1	10	3	8	7	48
1.6	11	13	9	3	11	2	8	9	66
1.7	12	13	9	5	9	3	7	11	69
1.8	9	6	5	10	7	6	3	1	47
1.9	13	8	11	8	6	7	2	9	64
2.0	2	3	3	4	4	4		2	22
2.1	1	2	1	5	3	1		4	17
2.2	4	5	1	5	1	1	2	3	22
2.3	1	1		2	2		1	3	10
2.4									0
2.5	3	3	1	7	1		1	5	21
2.6	1		2	1	1		1	1	7
2.6 +	4	2		15	7	2	2	8	40
Totals	64	69	55	68	65	29	37	73	460
Median	1.80	1.78	1.70	2.05	1.75	1.85	1.65	1.75	

Results of Metropolitan Achievement Test at End of Grade I
(Norm - Grade Placement 1.9) Subtest Recorded are
ARITHMETIC

Grade Placement	Douglass	F. Rushton	J. Fiske	Kealing	Lowell	Morse	Riverview	Stanley	TOTALS
1.0-	3		1						4
1.0	1	2		4	2				9
1.1				1			1	1	3
1.2	1	3			5			2	11
1.3	2	1	2				1		6
1.4	2	2	3	4	3		1	1	16
1.5		2	2	2	1		3		10
1.6	3	2	4		4		1	3	18
1.7	1	3	1	4	3			3	15
1.8	9	4	2	4	1	2	3	1	26
1.9	4	1	1	1	1	1		2	11
2.0	9	8	5	8	13	2	7	9	61
2.1	5	7	6	4	9	4	5	11	51
2.2	7	10	8	9	7	5	2	5	53
2.3	2	4	4	4	2	1	7		24
2.4	2	5	3	4	3	2	1	2	21
2.5	1	6	5	6	3	2	2	4	29
2.6	4	3	4	3	3	2	2	8	29
2.6 +	8	6	4	10	5	8	1	21	63
Totals	64	69	55	68	65	29	37	73	460
Median	2.0	2.15	2.15	2.15	2.05	2.30	2.10	2.20	

GRADE II - READING

Results of Pre and Post Achievement tests using the California Achievement test, Lower Primary (Pre-test, Form W; Post-test, Form X). Results based on Publisher's national, standard score, norms.

School	Pre-test Average	Post-test Average	Number	Change	F-Ratio
Douglass	36.2	43.2	70	7.0	19.814
Frank Rushton	39.8	46.0	73	6.2	9.091
John Fiske	33.7	43.7	66	10.0	32.633
Kealing	39.7	46.5	69	6.8	23.581
Lowell	41.3	47.7	59	6.4	7.923
Morse	35.4	39.8	35	5.4	4.100
Riverview	35.8	46.6	36	10.8	23.257
Stanley	40.2	53.7	55	13.5	39.551
All Title I	38.0	46.1	463	8.1	132.677

GRADE II
California Achievement - Reading

"F" Ratios, Degrees of Freedom, and Probability when comparing Variance of Pre and Post Reading Achievement tests.

School	"F" Ratio	Degrees of Freedom	Probability
Douglass (Pre & Post)	19.8141	139	$> .01$
Frank Rushton (Pre & Post)	9.0907	141	$> .01$
John Fiske (Pre & Post)	32.6327	128	$> .01$
Kealing (Pre & Post)	23.5809	134	$> .01$
Lowell (Pre & Post)	7.9226	123	$> .01$
Morse (Pre & Post)	4.1002	65	$> .05$
Riverview (Pre & Post)	23.2570	74	$> .01$
Stanley (Pre & Post)	39.5508	109	$> .01$
All Intensive Learning Centers (Pre & Post)	132.6774	920	$> .01$

GRADE II - ARITHMETIC

Results of Pre and Post Achievement test using the California Achievement test, Lower Primary (Pre-test, Form W; Post-test, Form X). Results based on Publishers National, standard score, norms.

School	Pre-test Average	Post-test Average	Number	Change	F-Ratio
Douglass	43.2	47.5	70	4.3	12.911
Frank Rushton	45.9	49.2	73	3.3	7.173
John Fiske	40.8	48.7	66	7.9	37.150
Kealing	44.4	49.8	69	5.4	18.437
Lowell	45.7	47.5	59	1.8	1.375
Morse	46.2	47.0	35	0.8	0.356
Riverview	43.8	50.7	36	6.9	32.797
Stanley	47.1	57.4	55	10.3	46.973
All Title I	44.5	49.7	463	5.2	104.629

GRADE II
California Achievement - Arithmetic

"F" Ratios, Degrees of Freedom, and Probability when comparing variance of Pre and Post arithmetic achievement tests.

School	"F" Ratio	Degrees of Freedom	Probability
Douglass (Pre & Post)	12.9108	139	> .01
Frank Rushton (Pre & Post)	7.1734	141	> .01
John Fiske (Pre & Post)	37.1496	128	> .01
Kealing (Pre & Post)	18.4374	134	> .01
Lowell (Pre & Post)	1.3749	123	< .05
Morse (Pre & Post)	0.3564	65	< .05
Riverview (Pre & Post)	32.7966	74	> .01
Stanley (Pre & Post)	46.9733	109	> .01
All Intensive Learning Centers (Pre & Post)	104.6288	920	> .01

Grade Placement of Students in Grade II, Based on Pre-Test Data
Grade Placement Recorded for Reading
Norms for Pre-Test Grade Placement Obtained from
Publishers National Norm Sample
READING

Grade Placement	Douglass	Frank Rushton	John Fiske	Kealing	Lowell	Morse	Riverview	Stanley	TOTAL
1.0		1	2						3
1.1	3	2	6				1	2	14
1.2	9	3	4	4	2	3	3	3	31
1.3	4	6	5	4	5	8	5	4	41
1.4	10	5	10	6	9	1	5	5	52
1.5	12	9	10	7	1	6	4	6	55
1.6	6	6	7	7	5	4	4	4	43
1.7	7	6	4	12	10	2	3	6	50
1.8	2	2		8	-		3	3	23
1.9		4	2	6	3	1		3	19
2.0	1	2	1	4	4	1	2	1	16
2.1	3	2	1	2	2		1		11
2.2	1	1			2			3	7
2.3	1			1	2		2	2	8
2.4	1	1	1	2	2			1	8
2.5		2			1			2	5
2.6	1	1		1		1			4
2.7		3			1			2	6
2.8									0
2.9		1	1	1	1			1	5
3.0 +		2			2	1		1	6
									407
Below G. P.	53	44	50	58	39	25	28	39	336
At G. P.	1	2	1	2	4	1	2	0	13
Above G. P.	7	13	3	5	13	2	3	12	58

Grade Placement of Students in Grade II Based on Post-test Data
Norms for Post-test Grade Placement Obtained from Publisher's National Norm Sample
READING

Grade Placement	Douglass	F. Rushton	J. Fiske	Kealing	Lowell	Morse	Riverview	Stanley	TOTALS
1.0		1	1						2
1.1									0
1.2		1							1
1.3	1	1	2	1	2		1		8
1.4	2	2	2		2	1		1	10
1.5	1	2	6	1	1	2	2	2	17
1.6	7	4	1	2	4	4	2	2	26
1.7	7	6	3	4	1	1		1	23
1.8	1	3	5			5	3	2	19
1.9	4	4		3	4	2	1	2	20
2.0	4	4	5	2	4	3	2	1	25
2.1	2	1	5	7	3	2	1	1	22
2.2	3		1	3	4	0	2	1	14
2.3	6	5	1	5	4	2	1		24
2.4	3	2	1	4	3		2	1	16
2.5			5	3	3	1	2	2	16
2.6	5	2	3		2		1		13
2.7	1	6	1	2	1		1	1	13
2.8	5	1		4		3	4	1	18
2.9	4	2	7	5	3		4	3	28
3.0	4	2	2	5	3	2	2	2	22
3.1									0
3.2	2	2	5	3	2		2	2	18
3.3	1	1	1	1	1		3	3	11
3.4	2	7		4	5			5	22
3.5									0
3.6	1	2	2	3	5			3	16
3.6 +	3	8	4	4	8	2	3	19	51
TOTAL	69	69	62	66	65	30	39	55	455
Below Gr. Placement	52	45	41	41	38	26	25	18	286
At Grade									

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Grade Placement of Students in Grade II, Based on Pre-Test Data
Grade Placement Recorded for Arithmetic
Norms for Pre-Test Grade Placement Obtained from
Publishers National Norm Sample
ARITHMETIC

Grade Placement	Douglass	Frank Rushton	John Fiske	Kealing	Lowell	Morse	Riverview	Stanley	TOTAL
1.0	1	1	3						5
1.1	1	1	4	1		1		3	11
1.2	1		5	1	4	1	1		13
1.3	9	4	7	7	4	2	3	1	37
1.4	8	4	8	3	3	1	5	4	36
1.5	5	5	10	3	5		4	3	35
1.6	12	4	1	7	3	7	4	1	39
1.7	6	6	1	9	5	3	5	4	39
1.8	8	11	3	9	11	2	2	6	52
1.9	3	1	2	6	2	2	5	6	27
2.0	1	5	4	10	1	2	1	9	33
2.1	1	3	3	5	3	2	2	3	22
2.2		1			5			4	10
2.3	3	4	1		2	2		1	13
2.4		6	1		2	2	1	1	13
2.5	1	1						1	3
2.6	1	1				1			3
2.7				1	1				2
2.8					1			3	4
2.9				1	1			1	3
3.0 +		1	1	2	3				7
									407
Below G. P.	54	37	44	56	37	19	29	37	313
At G. P.	1	5	4	5	1	2	1	3	22
	6	17		4	18	7	3	11	72

42

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Grade Placement of Students in Grade II Based on Post-test Data

Norms for Post-test Grade Placement Obtained from Publisher's National Norm Sample

ARITHMETIC

Grade Placement	Douglass	F. Rushton	J. Fiske	Kealing	Lowell	Morse	Riverview	Stanley	TOTALS
1.0									0
1.1									0
1.2		1	2		1				4
1.3	1		1						2
1.4	2			1	3	1			7
1.5		1			2	1			4
1.6	2	3	1		3	2	1		12
1.7	2		1	1		1			5
1.8	8	2	3	1	3	1	2	3	23
1.9	2	1	2	2	4	1			12
2.0	4	6	6		5	1	1		23
2.1	9	2	3	4	4	1	2		25
2.2	1	5	3	3	3			2	17
2.3	9	7	5	6	3	3	5	4	42
2.4	4	6	5	9	7	1	4	1	37
2.5	2	4	4	3	3	1		1	18
2.6	2	1	2	5	1	4	3	2	20
2.7	5	5	1	6	2		5	1	25
2.8	2	2	3	4	1	3	2	2	19
2.9	4	5	7	4	4	3	1	4	32
3.0	2	3	4	6	3	1	7	3	29
3.1	2	3	2	3	1		1	4	16
3.2	3	6	5	4	7		2	1	28
3.3	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	5	15
3.4	2	2	2	3	2			5	16
3.5									0
3.6									0
3.6 +		1			1	1	1	17	21
TOTAL	69	68	63	66	64	28	39	55	452
Below Gr. Placement	55	46	42	45	45	21	25	16	295
At Grade Placement	4	5	7	4	4	3	1	4	32

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Grade Placement of Students in Grade II, Based on Pre-Test Data
Grade Placement Recorded for Language
Norms for Pre-Test Grade Placement Obtained from
Publishers National Norm Sample
LANGUAGE

Grade Placement	Douglass	Frank Rushton	John Fiske	Kealing	Lowell	Morse	Riverview	Stanley	TOTAL
1.0			1						1
1.1		1						2	3
1.2			6	1	2	2	1		12
1.3	2	3	7	3	4	1	2	3	25
1.4	5	5	4	2	4	2	7	4	33
1.5	6	3	4	3	2	6	4	4	32
1.6	11	9	13	9	6	5	10	7	70
1.7	8	7	10	7	2	3	3	6	46
1.8	8	5	3	10	10	1	3	5	45
1.9	3	3	1		4	3		3	17
2.0	9	7	2	6	7	2	1	3	37
2.1	3	4	1	6	2	1		4	21
2.2	1	4	1	1	3		1	2	13
2.3	2	2	1	5	3			5	18
2.4	2	1		3	1				7
2.5		1		3	3				7
2.6				1	1				2
2.7		1		2	1				4
2.8				2					2
2.9		2			1			1	4
3.0 +	1	1		1		1			4
Below G. P.	43	36	49	41	34	24	31	39	297
At G. P.	9	7	2	6	7	2	1	4	38

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Grade Placement of Students in Grade II Based on Post-test Data

Norms for Post-test Grade Placement Obtained from Publisher's National Norm Sample

LANGUAGE

Grade Placement	Douglass	F. Rushton	J. Fiske	Kealing	Lowell	Morse	Riverview	Stanley	TOTALS
1.0				1					1
1.1			1						1
1.2		1						1	2
1.3					1				4
1.4				1	3				1
1.5	1								11
1.6		2	3		3	2	1		7
1.7	3	1	1	1		1			15
1.8	2		3	2	4	4			10
1.9		2	1	2	2	2		1	24
2.0	5	6	3	1	3	3		3	20
2.1	2	3	3	2	5	3	1	1	24
2.2	3	3	6	3	4	3	2		25
2.3	5	5	3	2	6	2	1	1	16
2.4	3	1	2	2	1		4	1	23
2.5	3	7	2	5	3		2	1	13
2.6	1	2	4	4		2			20
2.7	3	3	4	3	1		4	2	26
2.8	3	2	3	8	4	2	1	3	19
2.9	5		4	7	1	1		1	23
3.0	3	5	1	4	3	1	5	1	23
3.1	4	3	6	3	2		4	1	25
3.2	3	7	4	3	3	2	2	1	13
3.3	3	3	3		1		1	2	13
3.4	4	2	1		1		3	2	26
3.5	1	5	1	4	6	1	4	4	27
3.6	4	2	2	5	5		3	6	42
3.6 +	5	4	2	3	3	1	1	23	455
TOTAL	68	69	63	66	65	30	39	55	244
Below Gr. Placement	36	38	39	37	40	24	16	14	

Number of Students who are At or Above the norm in all three Categ
Reading, Arithmetic & Language
at Grade II on the California Achievement Pre-Test

Douglass	2
Frank Rushton	11
John Fiske	1
Kealing	3
Lowell	9
Morse	2
Riverview	1
Stanley	5
TOTAL	34

PARENTS' SURVEY

In addition to rather extensive pre and post testing data, other measures were used for project justification and project evaluation. After the completion of twenty-seven (27) weeks of the project, a questionnaire was distributed to parents of each child in the Intensive Learning Centers. One thousand, four hundred seventy-five (1,475) questionnaires were sent to parents, one thousand, forty-five (1,045) or 70% were returned to the school. Of the 1,045 returned, 329 were from parents of Kindergarten children, 368 were from parents of grade 1 children, and 348 were from parents of grade 2 children. Though possibly lacking in sophistication the questionnaire did attempt to get to the opinions of the parents in regard to how well their children like school, how interested they were in reading, writing, materials and audio visual equipment being taught and being used in the classroom. Items, 12, 13 and 14 allowed parents to express what they felt to be good, bad and ways of improving the program. The questionnaire with the tallied results will be included with this write-up.

It is interesting to note that 903 parents reported that their child liked school very much, while 9 reported that their child liked it not at all. Parents also reported increased interest in Reading and Writing and overwhelmingly reported that the use of the additional equipment and materials in the classroom were of benefit to their child. On Item 13, What do you like best about your child's class at school? . All eight of the Intensive Learning Centers reported that parents liked two teachers in the classroom, seven centers reported that the teacher's personal interest in the student and more time for reading were of significant help, and over half of the schools reported that the additional equipment was of great value to the child's class. In suggestions for improving the program, parents most often requested more homework of the child and secondly, that stronger discipline be

maintained at the school. They also requested, in some cases, that closer communication between parents be established.

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

As a part of the Project Evaluation and to ascertain the general feeling that teachers have towards the Intensive Learning Center at the Primary Level, a questionnaire was distributed to all teachers, principals, consultants, and counselors who worked in the schools at which the Intensive Learning Centers were operated. The results of this questionnaire may be slightly contaminated by the fact that some of the teachers who are not working directly in the program may be less than completely familiar with the materials used, the audio visual equipment, and the objectives of the program. However, as the enclosed evaluation composite sheet will show, certified personnel endorsed it wholeheartedly. One hundred sixty-one (161) teachers returned questionnaires. Of these, 136 teachers indicated that their pupils enjoyed school. Twenty-three indicated that students enjoyed school somewhat, and only two such students did not enjoy school. Of significance in planning, 82 of the teachers indicated yes and 29 somewhat to the question, "Do children seem to develop communications skills to a greater degree than previous years". Only ten said No. In subject matter areas and teaching procedures, one can judge that in the opinion of teachers and other certified personnel in the schools, the Intensive Learning Centers are outstanding successes. The questionnaire indicated that communication's skills greatly improved, children are more interested in books. The reduced teacher-ratio has helped individualize instruction and the project is superior to other programs in Language Arts. Teachers believe that audio visual aids increased learning, students feel more successful in the program, and that parents generally approve of the Intensive

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Learning Centers.

On Item 13 where teachers were free to list changes, variations or improvements that might be made, they suggested that it be extended to all the grades rather than just the primary, that there be more planning time, that there be better in-service workshops. Other suggestions were that consultant's duties be more clearly defined. The late reading time be changed and to use other Basal Series in addition to the materials presently being used.

It is the opinion of the parents, as previously stated, and certainly the opinion of the principals and teachers in the schools in which the Intensive Learning Centers are located that the program is an unqualified success and needs to be continued as well as expanded.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RESULTS OF PARENT SURVEY

Taken after 27 weeks of operation
of the Primary Intensive Learning Centers

1. Number of questionnaires distributed 1475
2. Number of questionnaires returned 1045 Percent 70
   Kindergarten 329, Grade 1, 368, Grade 2, 348
3. Does your child enjoy coming to school?
   Very much 903 Very little 96 Not at all 9
4. Has your child shown an increased interest in reading books?
   Very much 806 Very Little 175 Not at all 25
5. Does your child "say" or repeat" poems, rhymes and stories learned in school? Very often 617 Sometimes 377 Not at all 22
6. Has your child's interest in numbers increased through the use of new materials and equipment in the classroom such as the overhead projector, math drill tapes and listening stations? Very much 818 Very Little 203 Not at all
7. Does your child show an interst in numbers by counting objects, writing or saying combinations and repeating number poems?
   Very much 834 Very little 150 Not at all 23
8. Does having two teachers per room increase your child's chances to receive more individual attention, therefore more learning?
   Very much 826 Very Little 84 Not at all 22
9. Has the use of the new Little Owl and Sounds of Language textbooks increased your child's ability to speak out more readily than usual?
   Very much 601 Very little 193 Not at all 66
10. Has your child's ability to write creatively increased?
    Very much 635 Very little 246 Not at all 54
11. Has your child learned more through the use of additional equipment and materials in the classroom such as the tape recorder, listening stations, overhead projectors, record players, etc?
    Very much 725 Very little 126 Not at all 30
12. What does your child like best about his class at school?
    Reading 7, Math 6, Creative writing 6, Audio visual 7, Spelling 1, Teachers 1, classmates 1.

13. What do you like best about your child's class at school?
    2 teachers in classroom 8, Teachers personal interest 7, small classes 2 writing 4, additional equipment 4, More time for reading 1
14. What suggestions do you have for improving your child's Intensive Learning Program?

    More homework 3
    Closer communication between parents 1
    Stronger discipline 2
    Dependable psychologist 1
    Summer school 1
    Report 1
    small classes 1

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Language Bombardment Project Evaluation Questionnaire
For Principals and Teachers

An evaluation of all federal projects must be completed for a program to be re-funded next year. This questionnaire is merely one phase of the total evaluation plan. Please complete the questionnaire and return to your principal. Not all questions can be answered by all teachers; however, be as candid as possible.

1. What grade do you now teach? K- 6 - Special Ed. 161
2. Do your pupils seem to enjoy their school experiences? Yes 136 No 2 Somewhat? 23
3. Do children seem to be developing communication skills to a greater degree than in previous years? Yes 82 No 10 Somewhat 29
4. Is oral communications improving as a result of this program? Yes 82 No 4 Somewhat 30
5. Has pupil attendance improved as a result of this program? Yes 37 No 29 Somewhat 38
6. Do parents generally approve of the project? Yes 103 No 6 Somewhat 14
7. Do children seem to be more interested in books because of this program? Yes 108 No 4 Somewhat 19
8. To what extent has the reduced pupil teacher ratio helped instruction? Greatly 86 Not at all 7 Somewhat 29
9. Do you feel that this project is an improvement over the previous program in Language Arts? Yes 94 No 7 Somewhat 27
10. Are you familiar with the aims and Methods of the Language Bombardment Program? Yes 106 No 12 Somewhat 35
11. Does having more audio-visual aids in the classroom seem to contribute significantly to learning? Yes 117 No 0 Somewhat 21
12. Is there a marked increase in the pupils' feeling of success which could be attributed to this program? Yes 97 No 3 Somewhat 29
13. List any changes, variations, or improvements that might be made in the Language Bombardment Program. Please be concise.

Extend program to all grades
More planning time
Need manuals
Better in-service training workshops
Parental involvement
Consultant's duties more defined
More audio visual
Change time of the reading period
Use basal series and sounds of Language as a supplementary text.
Better in-service training workshop
Better screening of teachers.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Activity Description

Describe the activity including procedures and techniques utilized in implementati
How were the participants selected?
What was the pupil-teacher ratio?

The Intensive Learning Centers were placed in five schools using Model Cities' funds after one year of pilot study at Kealing Elementary School followed by a second year of expansion at Kealing and Douglass Elementary Schools funded under Title I ESEA. Result of the two year operation, upon evaluation, proved to be so successful that the value of taking the program to other elementary schools could not be questioned. The five schools selected for the Intensive Learning Centers in the Model Cities area qualified for Federal Funds on the basis of the educational deprivation of the students attending those schools.

Because of the nature of the program, it is not feasible to isolate only those who score below grade levels since pre-test results show that a large majority of students in each of the five centers would be substantially below grade level based on publishers' norms.

There are several unique features to the Intensive Learning Center. Two teachers are employed for each classroom thereby assuming a ratio approximately 14 students for each teacher. Beginning times of the school day are staggered with half of the students arriving at 8:00 o'clock in the morning with both teachers working with that half of the students. The other half of the students arrive at 9:00 o'clock and remain one hour beyond the dismissal time of those who arrived early. This gives teachers a chance to work an hour with those who arrived later. Lunch period times are also staggered thus creating four hours during the day when both teachers are working with only half of the class. The Language Arts part of the curriculum is taught

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

during the time that teachers work with the small groups. Team teaching is used for such subjects as Arithmetic, Sciences, and Social Science with all other subjects being taught cooperatively, by employing the strength of the teacher in a particular subject matter area. In this way, a teacher well versed in art or music might use her expertise while the strength of the other teacher might be used in some other subject matter area.

Another unique feature of the Intensive Learning Center is that prior to the beginning of each school year, all teachers who will be teaching in the Center go through an intensive one-week workshop so that new materials developed for the program might be studied. In addition, audio visual aids and equipment can be analyzed so that optimum use may be made of them. Each of the Intensive Learning Centers has one non-teaching consultant to work with the teachers of that center to enable them to have the benefit of an on-sight expert. Additionally, the consultant works with the development of new materials, and in addition, helps teachers with particularly difficult situations in their classrooms.

As a supportive service to the Intensive Learning Centers in the Model Cities' area, elementary counselors funded under both Title I ESEA and Model Cities are assigned so that there can be close liaison with homes. Additionally, elementary counselors work in adjustment problems of individual students. A third function of the elementary counselor is to serve as a liaison with other community agencies who may be of assistance to students and parents.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Measurement

Describe the method used to determine the effectiveness of the training received in this activity.

The Stanford Binet Intelligence Test was administered to approximately 120 students on a pre-test, post-test basis. The Stanford-Binet was deemed to be an appropriate test since the project itself leans towards correcting deficiencies in Reading and Reading Ability. Consequently, the non-reading Stanford-Binet was administered by certified Elementary Counselors and certified School Psychologists to a sample of ten percent of the students at each grade level in the project.

The Stanford-Binet was given at the beginning of the project and again at the end of the project to those who remained from the pre-tested group, which consisted of 38 students at the Kindergarten level, 34 students at Grade I, and 36 students at Grade II.

At the first grade, the Metropolitan Readiness Test was administered to all subjects at the grade level in each of the Intensive Learning Centers. As a post-test, the Metropolitan Achievement Test was administered to Grade I during the last month of the school year. Though results will be reported, the Metropolitan Readiness Test did not prove to be an adequate measure at the beginning of Grade I since norms are established on a random sample of students during 1964. Between that time of the standardization and the present, a great deal has been done to upgrade Kindergarten programs, consequently, the readiness tests at the beginning of Grade One proved to be much too simple for students who had been through a normal Kindergarten in school year 1969-1970. Further problems developed with the Metropolitan Readiness - Metropolitan Achievement Test comparisons, in that it is extremely difficult to match sub-tests for statistical comparison. Publisher reports the scores in the Readiness Tests in terms

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

of percentiles while the raw scores of each of the sub-tests of the Achievement Tests must be reported in Standard Scores and Grade Levels. To extrapolate and put each of the scores in a common measure requires some assumptions that may not prove valid on the basis of the norming of 1964. In order to get into a total score, it is necessary to average standard scores on the achievement test. Though, this is defensible statistically, there is little relationship between the appearance of the two scores finally submitted to statistical analysis.

At Grade Two, the California Achievement Test Lower Primary Battery was administered using Form W as a pre-test and Form X of the same battery as the pos-test. On this particular test, the norms are reported as beginning of the year norms and end of the year norms with standard score equivalence to raw scores at each level. Consequently, the test proved highly adequate and required no interpolation of scores whatsoever. Upon submitting to analysis of variance, results were quite encouraging at the Second grade level.

In addition to objective tests, given at the end of the year program, questionnaires were sent to all parents of students who had children in the Intensive Learning Centers after the twenty-seventh week of school. These questionnaires referred to the kinds of activities which increased achievement, the kinds of activities that created good attitudes on the part of the students and parents, and the part that audio visual equipment played in learning. A second questionnaire was given to all teachers who taught in schools where Intensive Learning Centers were operating. This included all teachers at all grade levels, as well as, principals and other certified personnel even though the Intensive Learning Center was operated for only Kindergarten, grades one,

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

and two. The results of the questionnaires are reported in narrative following the statistical analysis.

The Analysis of Variance Program was used to compare all pre and post test data. Not only was the Analysis of Variance completed for schools combined, but Analysis of Variance was also used to compare each school's pre and post test results on the Stanford Binet Intelligence Test at Grades, Kindergarten, One and Two, the Metropolitan Readiness Test, the Metropolitan Achievement Test at Grade One, and the California Achievement Test alternate forms at Grade Two.

In addition to the Analysis of Variance further work was done in establishing numbers of students who scored above grade level based on the National Norms at the beginning of the program, as well as, the end of the program. Further analysis was done in grade placement norms to indicate areas of strength and weakness upon which the in-service program for prospective teachers in future programs might benefit.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Performance Criteria

List the behavioral objectives of this activity. (Objectives that can be measured- What the student "can do" or "will do" at the end of the period of training.)

1. Pre and post test measurement using the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test to show that IQ can be increased at each grade level while the student is in the Intensive Learning Center.

2. Pre and Post Achievement Measure to show that achievement can be increased over the rate of achievement previously exhibited by the student.

3. To establish communication with parents so that they might be fully knowledgeable about and involved in the work of the student while he is in the Intensive Learning Center. This is done by pre-meetings with parents, use of elementary counselors as liasons and the distribution questionnaires testing parent attitude toward the program.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Analyzing Data

What was the basis for judging the progress of the group?
To what extent were the objectives achieved?

The Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test was administered to 10% random sample of students at the pre-test level. Post testing with the Stanford-Binet after attrition from the program resulted in 38 students included in the pre and post testing in Kindergarten, 34 students at the first grade level, and 36 student at the second grade level.

Since the random samples was made at each school, some schools had a very small number of students included in the sample. However, based on pre-test, post-test averages, all schools in Kindergarten level, with the exception of one, increased in IQ with the average increase being approximately 4.6 IQ point. At grade one, again all schools showed an increase, with the exception of one, with the overall analysis showed that the average increase in IQ at Grade One was 5.1 IQ points. Again, at Grade Two, one school showed a very small decrease in IQ but the overall average for the five Model Cities' Schools at Grade II showed an increase of 5.8 IQ points.

Even though individual schools do not always measure up to the results of the schools as a whole, the increase in IQ at Kindergarten, Grades One and Two was highly encouraging and extremely noteworthy.

Using the Stanford Binet, Norm of 100, it should be noted that of the 38 students at the Kindergarten level, only 11 scored at or above the Stanford Binet norm. Of the 34 at Grade One, only 6 registered scores higher than the norm and of the 36 students at Grade Two, only 8 were at the norm of 100 or above. Projecting the random selection to the total population in the Intensive Learning Center, it should be noted that approximately 70 to 80%

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

would be below the National average for ability at the time of pre-test . This statistic alone certainly justifies the necessity of having special programs in the Model Cities' schools.

At the Grade One level, the comparison of the Metropolitan Readiness Test as a pre-test to the Metropolitan Achievement Test as a post test proved inappropriate since the pre - test results placed the group on a percentile level above what might be expected from the students in the Intensive Learning Center based on all other measures. However, four table s were drawn up taking the sub-test of the Metropolitan Achievement Test , word discrimination, word knowledge , Reading and Arithmetic with median scores at the time of the post test indicated that the norm of 1. 9 was achieved at several schools on several other sub-tests. Considering all other data, it must be assumed that the students achieved rather substantially during the year in the Intensive Learning Center. Since ability and other measures would indicate that the near norm level on the post test was a substantial accomplishment. At Grade II, the California Achievement Test, Lower Primary , level form W was used as pre-test and the equivalent form X was used as a post test . Standard scores for the beginning of the year, Publishers' Norms were used for the pre-test and compared with the standard scores obtained from end of the year publishers norms on the post test. The result of the comparison showed that on Reading there was an individual gain in each school which resulted in an "F" ratio from the analysis of variance that was significant at the 1% level in four of the five schools and at the 5% level in one school. On Arithmetic, there was also a gain at each school

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

but that gain was not significant at one of the Model Cities' schools. All of the four other schools had increases in Arithmetic that were significant at the 1% level using one way analysis of variance. Further analysis was done with the individual student and their ranking comparative grade placement at pre test level and again at the post test level.

Combining the five schools, there were approximately 300 students who took the pre-test with only 32 of those placing above grade level. Upon completion of the program, 81 students scored above grade level with another 16 scoring at the grade level for Reading. Analysis of tables on Arithmetic and Language gives again the same picture. In the case of all three sub-tests, more students scored at or above grade level at the end of the program using end of the year norms than scored at or above grade level at the pre-test time using beginning of the year norms. A general statement then can be made indicating that not only were increases maintained but increases in achievement were accelerated over the year of the Intensive Learning Center.

The three performance objectives that were indicated earlier in this evaluation have then been met. The first to increase IQ of students in the Intensive Learning Center was proven at all three grades. The objective of accelerating achievement though slightly vague, at grade one was emphatically proven at Grade II. based on pre and post test data and the questionnaire along with counselor contacts in the Model Cities' area did much to accomplish the third performance objective.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

KINDERGARTEN

Results of Pre and Post-Test Average Scores
on the Stanford Binet Intelligence Test.
Results are based on a ten percent random sample of students in the project.

SCHOOL	Pre-Test Average	Post-Test Average	Number	Change	F-Ratio
Abbott	90.2	93.6	7	+3.4	.9648
Dunbar	91.0	97.0	9	+6.0	.7465
Fairfax	93.3	93.2	4	-0.1	.0000
Grant	97.3	101.0	4	+3.7	.1130
Hawthorne	96.1	100.8	14	+4.7	1.8634
Total Model Cities	93.2	97.8	38	+4.6	2.8753

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

GRADE I

Results of Pre & Post Test Average Scores
on the Stanford Binet Intelligence Test.

Results are based on a ten percent random sample of students in the Project

SCHOOL	Pre-Test Average	Post-Test Average	Number	Change	F-Ratio
Abbott	96.7	94.7	4	-2.0	.0215
Dunbar	91.1	98.3	7	7.2	1.5524
Fairfax	90.5	92.5	4	2.0	.0210
Grant	89.3	90.7	6	1.4	.0065
Hawthorne	92.2	100.5	13	8.3	4.665
Total Model Cities	91.9	97.0	34	5.1	2.1598

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

GRADE II

Results of Pre and Post Test Average Scores
on the Stanford Binet Intelligence Test
Results are based on a ten percent random sample of students in the project

School	Pre-Test Average	Post-Test Average	Number	Change	F-Ratio
Abbott	99.6	99.2	5	- .4	.0016
Dunbar	86.1	90.5	8	4.4	.6850
Fairfax	90.2	93.8	5	3.6	.1530
Grant	85.8	98.5	4	12.7	16.2902
Hawthorne	87.0	96.8	14	9.8	1.6330
All Model Cities	90.6	95.8	36	5.8	3.4179

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN GRADES K, 1 and 2

Who are at or above the Norm on the Stanford Binet Intelligence Scale
At the Pre-Test Time

SCHOOL	KINDERGARTEN	GRADE I	GRADE II
Abbott	1	1	2
Dunbar	1	1	1
Fairfax	1	1	2
Grant	2	1	0
Hawthorne	6	2	3
Total	11	6	8
Total Possible	38	34	36

GRADE I

METROPOLITAN READINESS-METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT

Results of Pre & Post Testing with the Metropolitan Readiness and Achievement Tests. Results are based on interpolated standard score values for the Readiness Test and average standard score values for the Achievement Tests.

SCHOOL	Pre-Test Average	Post-Test Average	Number	Change
Abbott	48.9	43.3	59	- 5.6
Dunbar	49.6	43.0	76	- 6.6
Fairfax	57.2	51.0	42	- 6.2
Grant	56.1	42.4	53	-13.7
Hawthorne	~~47.1~~ 52.2	~~52.2~~ 47.1	127	- 5.1
All Schools	52.0	44.1	357	- 7.9

Results of Metropolitan Achievement Test at End of Grade I
(Norm - Grade Placement 1.9)
WORD DISCRIMINATION

Grade Placement	Abbott	Dunbar	Fairfax	Grant	Hawthorne	TOTAL
1.0-	1					1
1.0	1			1		2
1.1	2	3				5
1.2	4	10		5	13	32
1.3	2	12		6	9	29
1.4	9	6	2	7	16	40
1.5	5	10	1	2	17	35
1.6	4		3	2	10	19
1.7	8	4	4	7	14	37
1.8	1	4	5	2	5	17
1.9	6	5	3	2	8	24
2.0	2	6	3	5	6	22
2.1	2	3		3	5	13
2.2	2	2	1		8	13
2.3		3	3		4	10
2.4	1	2	2	1	1	7
2.5	1	2	1	2	4	10
2.6	2		4	1	2	9
2.6+	2	5	8	3	10	28
TOTALS	55	77	40	49	132	353
Median	1.7	2.1	2.0	1.7	1.7	

Results of Metropolitan Achievement Test at End of Grade I
(Norm - Grade Placement 1.9)
WORD KNOWLEDGE

Grade Placement	Abbott	Dunbar	Fairfax	Grant	Hawthorne	TOTAL
1.0-				1		1
1.0		1		1	1	3
1.1	2	1		2	2	7
1.2	2	12	1	2	9	26
1.3	4	4	1	4	12	25
1.4	5	12	2	10	13	42
1.5	9	9	2	6	27	53
1.6	10	6	5	2	14	37
1.7	10	6	8	9	11	44
1.8	6	10	5	5	11	37
1.9		2	2	2	5	11
2.0		1	2		2	5
2.1	1	1	1	2	7	12
2.2						0
2.3	1	1	3	2	3	10
2.4	1	2	3		4	10
2.5						0
2.6						
2.6+	3	7	5	2	5	22
TOTALS	54	75	40	50	126	345
Median	1.8	1.7	1.9	1.6	1.7	

Results of Metropolitan Achievement Test at End of Grade I
(Norm - Grade Placement 1.9)
READING

Grade Placement	Abbott	Dunbar	Fairfax	Grant	Hawthorne	TOTAL
1.0-						0
1.0				2		2
1.1	1	1		2	1	5
1.2	4	1		1	1	7
1.3		8	1	4	6	19
1.4	2		1	4	5	12
1.5	7	9	1	10	14	41
1.6	8	16	3	8	16	51
1.7	8	13	7	8	28	64
1.8	6	6	7	3	14	36
1.9	7	5	1	4	3	25
2.0	5	2	5	1	8	21
2.1	3	5	2	1	4	15
2.2		2	2		6	10
2.3	1					1
2.4						0
2.5	1	1	4		3	9
2.6						0
2.6+	2	10	4	1	11	28
TOTALS	55	79	38	49	125	346
Median	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.6	1.7	

Results of Metropolitan Achievement Test at End of Grade I
(Norm - Grade Placement 1.9)
ARITHMETIC

Grade Placement	Abbott	Dunbar	Fairfax	Grant	Hawthorne	TOTAL
1.0-		1				1
1.0	3	5		4	3	15
1.1		2			5	7
1.2	1	3		3	3	10
1.3	1	1			7	9
1.4	7	8			6	21
1.5	1			3	5	9
1.6	2	3	1	6	4	16
1.7	4	5		3	10	22
1.8	8	7	1	6	12	34
1.9	1	2		1	8	12
2.0	11	5	4	6	11	37
2.1	7	3	4	2	14	30
2.2	1	10	5	5	13	34
2.3	2	6	3	3	2	16
2.4	1	6	7	5	5	24
2.5	1	2	5	3	7	18
2.6	1	2	5		3	11
2.6+	2	5	4		11	22
TOTALS	54	76	39	50	129	348
Median	1.9	2.0	2.4	1.9	2.0	

Grade II - READING

Results of Pre & Post Achievement Tests using the California Achievement Test, Lower Primary (Pre-test, Form W. Post Test, Form X). Results based on Publisher's National, Standard Score Norms.

SCHOOL	Pre-Test Average	Post-Test Average	Number	Change	F-Ratio
Abbott	35.3	45.8	61	10.5	49.8195
Dunbar	35.9	42.4	77	6.5	20.8004
Fairfax	43.7	49.2	42	5.5	7.8202
Grant	36.4	40.4	38	4.0	4.0708
Hawthorne	39.6	50.2	123	10.6	52.8280
All Model Cities	38.0	46.3	341	8.3	111.2519

GRADE II

California Achievement - Reading
"F" Ratios, Degrees of Freedom, and Probability when comparing Variance of Pre & Post Reading Achievement Tests

SCHOOL	"F" Ratio	Degree of Freedom	Probability
Abbott (Pre & Post)	49.8195	119	$>.01$
Dunbar (Pre & Post)	20.8004	149	$>.01$
Fairfax (Pre & Post)	7.8202	78	$>..01$
Grant (Pre & Post	4.0708	76	$>.05$
Hawthorne (Pre & Post)	52.8280	244	$>.01$
All Model Cities (Pre & Post)	111.2519	670	$>.01$

GRADE II ARITHMETIC

Results of Pre & Post Achievement Test using the California Achievement Test, Lower Primary (Pre-Test, Form W; Post Test, Form X). Results based on Publisher's National Standard Score Norms

SCHOOL	Pre-Test Average	Post - test Average	Number	Change	"F" Ratio
Abbott	42.0	49.3	61	7.3	27.7984
Dunbar	42.1	49.8	77	7.7	29.2639
Fairfax	45.9	52.2	42	6.3	17.2577
Grant	42.6	41.7	38	- .9	0.2582
Hawthorne	43.5	46.8	123	3.3	50.2282
All Model Cities	43.0	48.8	341	5.8	95.8988

GRADE II

California Achievement - Arithmetic

"F" Ratios, Degrees of Freedom & Probability when comparing variance of Pre & Post Arithmetic Achievement Tests

SCHOOL	"F" Ratio	Degrees of Freedom	Probability
Abbott (Pre & Post)	27.7984	119	> .01
DUNBAR (Pre & Post)	29.2639	149	> .01
Fairfax (Pre & Post)	17.2577	78	> .01
Grant (Pre & Post)	.2582	76	< .05
Hawthorne (Pre & Post)	50.2282	244	> .01
All Model Cities	95.8988	670	> .01

Grade Placement of Students in Grade II Based on Pre-Test Data
Norms obtained from Publisher's National Norm Table
READING

Grade Placement	Abbott	Dunbar	Fairfax	Grant	Hawthorne	TOTAL
1.0		1		1		2
1.1	1	5			1	7
1.2	3	6		3	7	19
1.3	7	10	1	6	12	36
1.4	8	10	1	9	16	44
1.5	13	9	4	1	15	42
1.6	9	9	5	3	11	39
1.7	6	4	5	6	10	31
1.8	2	3	3	2	12	22
1.9	1	2	3	3	7	17
2.0	1	6	4	1	7	19
2.1	2	1	2	1	1	7
2.2					1	2
2.3	1	1		1	4	6
2.4		1			1	2
2.5	1	2			1	4
2.6	1		1		1	3
2.7					1	1
2.8			1		1	2
2.9		1			3	4
3.0					1	1
3.1						
3.2					1	1
3.3					1	1
3.4					2	2
3.5						
3.6						
3.6+					1	1
Below Gr. Placement	54	59	26	34	92	264
At Grade Placement	0	6	2	1	7	16
Above Grade Placement	1	4	5	2	20	32

Grade Placement of Students in Grade II Based on Post-Test Data
Norms obtained from Publisher's National Norm Table
READING

Grade Placement	Abbott	Dunbar	Fairfax	Grant	Hawthorne	TOTAL
1.0						
1.1		1			1	2
1.2		1			1	2
1.3	2	1		1		4
1.4		3				3
1.5	1	3		3	1	8
1.6		2	1	3	4	10
1.7	3	3		5	6	17
1.8	2	2		1		5
1.9	3	4	3	4	8	22
2.0	2	7	1	2	5	17
2.1	1	5	2	3	4	15
2.2	6	4	1	1	5	17
2.3	4	6	2	1	3	16
2.4	2	3	6	6	7	24
2.5	9	2	3	2	2	18
2.6		4	1		6	11
2.7	4	7		1	6	18
2.8	3	4	1		7	15
2.9	5	3	1	1	6	16
3.0	3		1	1	4	11
3.1						
3.2	1	1	3	1	4	10
3.3	3				6	9
3.4		4	3	3	9	19
3.5						
3.6	2	1	3		8	14
3.6+	2	2	1		15	20
Below Gr. Placement	42	58	21	33	66	220
At Grade Placement	5	3	1	1	6	16
Above Gr. Placement	11	8	11	5	46	81

Grade Placement of Students in Grade II Based On Pre-Test Data.
Norms obtained from Publishers National Norm Table
ARITHMETIC

Grade Placement	Abbott	Dunbar	Fairfax	Grant	Hawthorne	TOTAL
1.0	1	2		1	2	6
1.1	2	3			5	10
1.2	4	6		4	5	19
1.3	8	7	3	2	15	35
1.4	7	9	1	6	11	34
1.5	7	4	5	4	8	28
1.6	10	7	4	6	10	37
1.7	1	7	3	2	10	23
1.8	4	10	7	8	19	48
1.9	2	2	2		6	12
2.0	2	5	3	3	15	28
2.1	1	4	1			6
2.2	1			1	3	5
2.3	1	1	3		2	7
2.4					5	7
2.5	1	1	1		1	4
2.6					2	2
2.7						
2.8						
2.9						
3.0						
3.1						
3.2		1				1
3.3						
3.4						
3.5						
3.6						
3.6+						
Below Gr Placement	49	57	28	33	92	258
At Gr. Placement	1	5	1	3	15	25
Above Gr. Placement	4	7	4	1	13	29

Grade Placement of Students in Grade II Based On Post-Test Data
Norms obtained from Publishers National Norm Table
ARITHMETIC

Grade Placement	Abbott	Dunbar	Fairfax	Grant	Hawthorne	TOTAL
1.0						
1.1						
1.2						
1.3	1	3	2	3	2	11
1.4	1	2		1	1	5
1.5	1	2		1	4	8
1.6		1			2	3
1.7	2				1	3
1.8	1	3	1	3	3	11
1.9	2	4	1	3	2	12
2.0	2	3	2	4	8	19
2.1	3	2	4	4	7	20
2.2		2			3	5
2.3	9	3	1	3	6	22
2.4	3	6	3	2	13	27
2.5	5	1	2	3	5	16
2.6	3	7	2	4	4	20
2.7	5	5	2	2	8	22
2.8	4	5	1		5	15
2.9	4	7	2	3	3	19
3.0		1			6	7
3.1	1	5	5		8	15
3.2	2	2	2	1	11	17
3.3	4	2	1		10	17
3.4	1	2	1		9	15
3.5						
3.6						
3.6+		1	1		3	5
Below Gr. Placement	42	49	21	33	74	218
At Grade Placement	4	7	2	3	3	19
Above Grade Placement	8	13	10	1	43	75

Grade Placement of Students in Grade II Based on Pre-Test Data
Norms obtained from Publisher's National Norm Table
LANGUAGE

Grade Placement	Abbott	Dunbar	Fairfax	Grant	Hawthorne	TOTAL
1.0					3	3
1.1		3			1	4
1.2	5			1	2	8
1.3	3	5		2	4	14
1.4	8	7	3	6	7	31
1.5	6	10	5	2	11	34
1.6	9	12	12	4	19	56
1.7	5	3	5	10	13	36
1.8	6	7	2	8	12	35
1.9	3	9	1		7	20
2.0	2	7	3	2	11	25
2.1	2	1	1		7	11
2.2		1			2	3
2.3	1	1	1		5	8
2.4	2	1		1	2	6
2.5	1				4	5
2.6	1			1	1	3
2.7		2			2	4
2.8					4	4
2.9					2	2
3.0						
3.1						
3.2						
3.3						
3.4						
3.5						
3.6						
3.6+						
Below Gr. Placement	49	56	31	33	79	248
At Grade Placement	0	7	1	2	11	21
Above Gr. Placement	5	6	1	2	29	43

Grade Placement of Students in Grade II Based on Post-Test Data
Norms obtained from Publisher's National Norm Table
LANGUAGE

Grade Placement	Abbott	Dunbar	Fairfax	Grant	Hawthorne	TOTAL
1.0		1				1
1.1						
1.2						
1.3				1		1
1.4		1				1
1.5		2		1	2	5
1.6	1	2	2	1	1	7
1.7	1	2	2	5	3	13
1.8	3	7	3	2	2	17
1.9		1	3	5	2	11
2.0	5	5	2	1	2	15
2.1	2	2	2	3	3	12
2.2	2	3	5	4		14
2.3	2	3	2	2	5	14
2.4	4	4	3	2	2	15
2.5	4	4	2		6	16
2.6	2	4	1	3	6	16
2.7	4	6	1		4	15
2.8	4	3	1	2	3	13
2.9	4	2	1	2	5	12
3.0	3	1	1	2	6	13
3.1	2	2		1	8	13
3.2	1	7			10	18
3.3	4		1		2	7
3.4	1				2	3
3.5	1	3			9	13
3.6	1	2			7	10
3.6+	3	2	1		29	35
Below Grade Placement	34	50	29	32	41	186
At Grade Placement	4	2	1	2	5	14
Above Grade Placement	16	17	3	3	73	112

Number of Students at or above Grade Level on all Three Sub-Tests, READING, LANGUAGE AND ARITHMETIC (Pre & Post) California Achievement, Lower Primary

GRADE II

SCHOOL	Pre	Post
Abbott	1	7
Dunbar	6	7
Fairfax	1	2
Grant	2	4
Hawthorne	13	31

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PARENTS' SURVEY

In addition to rather extensive pre and post testing data, other measures were used for project justification and project evaluation. After the completion of twenty-seven (27) weeks of the project, a questionnaire was distributed to parents of each child in the Intensive Learning Centers. One thousand, sixty questionnaires were sent to parents, seven hundred thirty six were returned to the school. Of the 736 questionnaires returned, 271 were from the parents of Kindergarten students, 227 from parents of First grade students, and 238 from parents of Second grade students.

The questionnaire was an attempt to get the opinion of parents in regard to how well their children liked school, how interested they were in Reading, and Writing and how the parents felt about the materials and audio visual equipment being used in the classroom. Items 12, 13, and 14 of the Questionnaire allowed parents to express what they felt to be good, bad and ways of improving the program. The questionnaire with the tallied results will be included with this narrative.

It is interesting to note that 610 parents reported their children liked school very much. Sixty-six reported their children like school very litte, and seven reported their children did not like school at all. Parents also reported increased interest in Reading and Writing. An overwhelming number reported that the use of additional equipment and materials in the classroom were of benefit to their child.

On Item 13, What do you like best about your child's class at school? All five of the Intensive Learning Centers reported that parents liked for two teachers to be in the classroom. Ther personal interest shown to students by teachers and the new equipment being used by teachers as teaching aids.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

In suggestions for improving the program, Item 14 on the Questionnaire, parents most often requested that more homework be given to the children and that stronger discipline be maintained at school. They also felt that more field trips would be beneficial to students.

It would be beneficial for any reader of this report to take a rather thorough look at the composite tabulation of responses on the questionnaire distributed to parents to get a full picture of the parent's feeling of the program.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TO: Parents of Children Attending Model Cities Schools in the Primary Project Area

FROM: Paul L. Mobiley, Director of Model Cities Projects

SUBJECT: Project Evaluation

Your child has been attending school in the special "Language Bombardment Project" or Intensive Learning Centers in the Model Cities' area for the last eighteen weeks. During this time, we hope you have observed your child's progress closely enough to help us evaluate his/her progress in these Intensive Learning classes.

It is important that you complete and return the enclosed questionnaire with your child's grade card. Thank you for co-operating with the school.

Please do not sign the questionnaire.

1. What Model Cities school does your child attend?

Abbott X Dunbar X Fairfax X
Grant X Hawthorne X

2. What grade is your child?

Kindergarten 271 First 227 Second 238

3. Does your child enjoy coming to school?

Very much 610 Very little 66 Not at all 7

4. Has your child shown an increased interest in reading books?

Very much 487 Very little 118 Not at all 14

5. Does your child "say" or "repeat" poems, rhymes and stories learned at school?

Very often 444 Sometimes 264 Not at all 13

6. Has your child's interest in numbers increased through the use of new materials and equipment in the classroom such as the overhead projector, math drill tapes and listening stations?

Very much 498 Very little 158 Not at all 18

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

7. Does your child show an interest in numbers by counting objects, writing or saying combinations and repeating number poems?

Very much 564 Very little 120 Not at all 10

8. Does having two teachers per room increase your child's chances to receive more individual attention, therefore more learning?

Very much 579 Very little 54 Not at all 20

9. Has the use of the new Little Owl and Sounds of Language textbooks increased your child's ability to speak out more readily than usual?

Very much 397 Very little 145 Not at all 25

10. Has your child's ability to write creatively increased?

Very much 433 Very little 184 Not at all 25

11. Has your child learned more through the use of additional equipment and Materials in the classroom such as the tape recorder, listening stations, overhead projectors, record players, etc.?

Very much 482 Very little 97 Not at all 14

12. What does your child like best about his class at school?

Reading, Math, Drawing, Music, Games

13. What do you like best about your child's class at school?

Two teachers per room, additional equipment, parents like the teachers because they show personal interst in students.

14. What suggestions do you have for improving your child's Intensive Learning Program?

Need more discipline in classrooms.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

As a part of the Project Evaluation to ascertain the general feeling that teachers have towards the Intensive Learning Center at the primary level, a questionnaire was distributed to all teachers, principals, consultants, and counselors who worked in the schools at which Intensive Learning Centers were operated.

The results of this Questionnaire may be slightly contaminated by the fact some of the teachers who are not working directly in the program may be less than completely familiar with the materials used, the audio visual equipment and the objectives of the program; However, as the enclosed evaluation composite sheet will show, certified personnel endorsed wholeheartedly. One hundred and twenty teachers returned questionnaires. Of these 105 teachers indicated that the children in the program liked school and enjoyed their school experience, 15 indicated that students liked school somewhat, and only one teacher indicated that students did not like school.

The Language Bombardment Program emphasizes communications' skills. 43 teachers indicated that they believed children were developing communications' skills to a greater degree than previous years. 39 teachers indicated that they believed that this development was somewhat better than previous years, only 9 teachers indicated that they did not believe Language Bombardment was an improvement over previous programs.

In subject matter areas and teaching procedures, one can judge that in the opinion of the teachers and other certified personnel in the Intensive Learning Centers are outstanding successes. The questionnaire

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

indicates that communication skills greatly improved and the children are more interested in books. Reduced student -teacher ratio has helped individualize instruction and the project is superior to other programs in the Language Arts' area. Teachers believe that audio visual aid increased learning. Students feel more successful in the program and parents generally approve the Intensive Learning Centers.

On Item 13, where teachers are free to list changes, variations or improvements that might be made, they suggested that parent - teacher conferences be held on school time; that Language Bombardment be combined with other basal texts; that there be more emphasis on phonics.

Again, the reader of this report is encouraged to study the composite of the Teacher Questionnaire thoroughly to get the overall picture of what the teachers really feel about the success of the Language Bombardment programs in the Model Cities' elementary schools.

It is the opinion of the parents, as previously stated, certainly the opinion of the principals and the teachers in the schools in which the Intensive Learning Centers are located that the program is an unqualified success and needs to be continued, as well as, expanded.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TO: Principals and Teachers in Model Cities Schools Where Language Bombardment Program is in Operation

FROM: Paul L. Mobiley, Director of Model Cities Projects

SUBJECT: Project Evaluation

An evaluation of all federal projects must be completed for a program to be re-funded next year. This questionnaire is merely one phase of the total evaluation plan. Please complete the questionnaire and return to your principal. Not all questions can be answered by all teachers; however, be as candid as possible.

Do not sign questionnaire

1. What grade do you now teach? 120 (Kindergarten through 6)
2. Do your pupils seem to enjoy their school experiences? Yes 105 No. 1 Somewhat? 15
3. Do children seem to be developing communication skills to a greater degree than in previous years? Yes 43 No 9 Somewhat 39
4. Is oral communications improving as a result of this program? Yes 47 No 13 Somewhat 29
5. Has pupil attendance improved as a result of this program? Yes 17 No 31 Somewhat 18
6. Do parents generally approve of the project? Yes 49 No 8 Somewhat [illegible]
7. Do children seem to be more interested in books because of this program? Yes 53 No 10 Somewhat 23
8. To what extent has the reduced pupil teachers ratio helped instruction? Greatly 49 Not at all 6 Somewhat 22
9. Do you feel that this project is an improvement over the previous program in Language Arts? Yes 48 No 14 Somewhat 20
10. Are you familiar with the aims and methods of the Language Bombardment Program? Yes 65 No 15 Somewhat 31
11. Does having more audio-visual aids in the classroom seem to contribute significantly to learning? Yes 79 No. 2 Somewhat 13
12. Is there a marked increase in the pupils' feeling of success which would be attributed to this program? Yes 50 No 12 Somewhat 19
13. List any changes, variations, or improvements that might be made in the Language Bombardment Program. Please be concise.

    1. Parent-teacher conferences on school time.
    2. Ability grouping
    3. Teacher Aides needed
    4. Combining Language Bombardment with basal text.
    5. More emphasis on phonics.
    6. Another test in place of California Achievement Test